

Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12-19, 21, 23, 25-26, 29-33, 35, 37-39, and 41 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12-13, 15-19, 21, 23, 25-26, 29-33, 35, 37-39, and 41; cancelled claims 4, 6-7, 9, 11, 20, 22, 27-28, 34, and 40. No claims have been added. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 13, 25-26, 30, and 35 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action mailed November 23, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 23 as being dependent on claims 11 and 22 respectively. In response, the Applicant has cancelled claims 11 and 22 and has amended claims 12 and 23 to address the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 101 concerns. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-21, and 25-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0120648 issued to Ball et al. ("Ball") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,624 issued to Chen et al. ("Chen"). The Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable over Ball in view of Chen and has amended independent claims 1, 13, 25-26, 30, and 35 to more clearly define thereover.

The claimed invention, as set forth in the amended independent claims, is directed to systems and methods for archiving reference material cited in a manuscript by an author of the manuscript. Amended independent claim 13 is fairly representative of the

claimed invention as set forth in amended independent claims 1, 26, 30, and 35. As such, the Applicant will show below how amended independent claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Ball in view of Chen. The Applicant will separately show below how amended independent claim 25 patentably distinguishes over Ball in view of Chen.

Amended independent claim 13 recites a method for archiving reference material cited in a bibliography of a manuscript by an author of the manuscript. The method includes an author of a manuscript using a web site on the Internet as a reference for the manuscript. The author transmits the address of the web site to a database connected to the Internet using a first communications device connected to the Internet. The database obtains a copy of the web site from the Internet upon receiving the web site address from the author such that the copy of the web site obtained by the database is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the author transmitted the web site address to the database. A distinctive key is associated with the copy of the web site. The database stores the copy of the web site with the distinctive key. The author cites the web site as being a reference for the manuscript by listing identification of the web site along with the distinctive key in the bibliography of the manuscript. An audience of the manuscript obtains the distinctive key from the bibliography of the manuscript. The audience transmits the distinctive key to the database using a second communications device connected to the Internet in order to request the database for the copy of the web site. The database transmits a copy of the stored copy of the web site to the audience via the Internet and the second communications device in response to the database receiving the distinctive key from the audience such that the copy of the web site transmitted from the database to the audience is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the author transmitted the web site address to the database.

Claim 15, which depends from amended independent claim 13, recites that the database associates the distinctive key with the copy of the web site. In this case, the method further includes transmitting the distinctive key from the database to the author via the Internet and the first communications device. Claim 18, which depends from amended independent claim 13, recites that the author associates the distinctive key with the copy of the web site.

Accordingly, the method set forth in amended independent claim 13 includes the following features:

1. The database stores a copy of the web site as cited in a manuscript by the author of the manuscript and stores a distinctive key associated with the copy of the web site;
2. The author lists in the manuscript the distinctive key;
3. The audience of the manuscript obtains the distinctive key from the manuscript; and
4. The database transmits a copy of the stored copy of the web site to the audience upon receiving a request from the audience in which the request includes the distinctive key (and, as a result, the audience obtains a copy of the web site as the web site stood on the Internet at the time the author cited the web site in the manuscript).

Accordingly, the method enables an audience of a manuscript, which may be reading the manuscript years after the manuscript has been written by the author, to obtain a copy of the web site cited by the author in the manuscript at the time the author wrote the manuscript. As such, regardless of whether the web site has been changed, moved, removed, or updated any time after the author referenced the web site for the manuscript, the audience of the manuscript is able to obtain a copy of the web site as the web site stood at the time the author referenced the web site for the manuscript.

The audience is able to obtain a copy of the web site as the web site stood at the time the author wrote the manuscript because 1) the database stores a copy of the web site as the web site stood at the time the author wrote the manuscript, 2) the database stores a distinctive key with the stored copy of the web site, 3) the author lists the distinctive key in the manuscript, 4) the audience obtains the distinctive key from the manuscript, and 5) the audience forwards a request for the copy of the web site from the database in which the request includes the distinctive key. Accordingly, the distinctive key uniquely identifies the copy of the web site which was used by the author and knowledge of the distinctive key is transferred from the author to the audience via the manuscript. Consequently, the audience is made aware

of the specific version of the web site that the author used when writing the manuscript and is able to obtain this version of the web site from the database.

Accordingly, the claimed invention addresses the problem with authors of manuscripts citing web sites as sources of information for their manuscripts. As indicated in the Background Art section of the Applicant's specification, the problem with authors of manuscripts citing web sites as sources of information for their manuscripts is that i) web sites are subject to frequent, invisible modification; and ii) web sites may be moved to a new address or removed from the Internet without notice. An important reason for citing reference material from any source such as web site and traditional published material is to enable verification of the reference material. The problem with an author citing a web site as reference material in a manuscript is that the fluid, ever modifiable potential of the content of the web site does not guarantee availability and true verification of the web site material actually used by the author.

The Applicant previously submitted, with the Amendment dated June 10, 2004, the article entitled "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow: Studying How Online Footnotes Vanish" by Carlson, <http://chronicle.com>, April 2004 - published in 'The Chronicle of Higher Education' (<http://chronicle.com>), which is further evidence of the problem with citing web sites as sources of information for manuscripts. This article describes the problem associated with "the half-life of Internet footnotes" and how this problem arises from "the typical length of time it takes for half of the Web addresses in a scholarly article to become outdated, broken, or changed." A study described in the article noted that the half life of links to web sites was just over a year. The article notes that it is a goal to allow "the Web and Internet-related topics [to be] investigated with the same reliability that one would find in the library."

Further, the Applicant previously submitted, with the Appeal Brief dated September 16, 2005, the article entitled, "Scholars Note 'Decay' of Citations to Online References" by Carlson, <http://chronicle.com>, March 2005 - published in 'The Chronicle of Higher Education' (<http://chronicle.com>), which is further evidence of the problem with citing

web sites as sources of information for manuscripts. This article notes the problem of “how Web links stop working, or ‘decay,’ as those sites change addresses or shut down.” Particularly, this article notes:

After analyzing more than 1,126 citations that make reference to Web addresses, taken from online versions of five prestigious communication-studies journals, 373 of the links, or 33 percent, were found to be dead. Of the 753 of the links that worked, only 424 pointed to information pertinent to the citation.

As described above, the claimed invention overcomes the problem with citing web sites as sources of information for manuscripts and, as described above, a solution to this problem has been desired by those of at least ordinary skill in the art a few years after the Applicant’s filing date.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cited Ball in view of Chen as rendering the claimed invention obvious. Both Ball and Chen appear to disclose the concept of storing different versions of a web site in a database such that a user may subsequently obtain any of the web site versions from the database. Chen further appears to disclose associating time stamps with the stored versions of the web site. In this event, a user may obtain a version of the web site as it stood at a particular point in time by providing the web site address along with the associated time stamp to the database.

Unlike the claimed invention, neither Ball nor Chen teach or suggest a first user (i.e., an author of a manuscript) identifying a particular version of a web site as being of interest to the first user (i.e., the author citing the particular web site version as a reference source for the manuscript), a database storing the particular web site version along with a distinctive key associated with the particular web site version irrespective of storing other web site versions, the first user identifying to a second user that the particular web site version is of interest to the first user (i.e., the author listing the distinctive key in the manuscript for the audience of the manuscript to obtain), and the second user retrieving the particular web site version from the database by providing the database with the distinctive key which is associated

with the particular web site version. Unlike the claimed invention, neither Ball nor Chen teach or suggest a second user (i.e., the audience) being apprised by a first user (i.e., the author) of a particular version of a web site, which is stored in a database upon the directive of the first user, such that the second user may obtain the particular web site version from the database after being apprised by the first user of the particular web site version.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 13, 26, 30, and 35, as amended, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ball and Chen. Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10, 14-19, 21, 29, 31-33, 37-39, and 41 depend from one of the amended independent claims and include the limitations of their respective independent claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Ball and Chen.

Amended independent claim 25 recites a system in which an author transmits a copy of reference material and reference material availability information to a database. The author lists in a manuscript a distinctive key associated with both the copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information. The database stores the copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information along with the associated distinctive key. If the reference material is available, the database transmits a copy of the reference material to the audience of the manuscript in response to receiving a request having the distinctive key from the audience for a copy of the reference material. If the reference material is not available, the database transmits a copy of the reference material availability information to the audience in response to receiving a request having the distinctive key from the audience for a copy of the reference material.

Neither Ball nor Chen, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an author providing a copy of reference material and its availability information to a database for storage along with a distinctive key, the author listing in a manuscript the key, the database providing or not providing a copy of the reference material to the audience of the manuscript in response

to receiving a request having the key from the audience depending upon the availability information of the reference material.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that independent claim 25, as amended, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ball and Chen. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Ball and Chen.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-12 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball in view of Chen in further view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0152215 issued to Clark et al. ("Clark"). Claims 11 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 12 and 23 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 13, respectively. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Ball, Chen, and Clark.

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12-19, 21, 23, 25-26, 29-33, 35, 37-39, and 41, as amended, meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2005

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

SRIKRISHNA TALLURI

By 

James N. Kallis

Reg. No. 41,102

Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 26, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351